



**Executive Board of
the United Nations
Development Programme
and of the United Nations
Population Fund**

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1994/SR.2
8 March 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE BOARD

First regular session of 1994

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 2nd MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 15 February 1994, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. ANSARI

(India)

CONTENTS

Organization of the work of the Executive Board (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD (continued)

1. Mr. BANGALI (Sierra Leone) said that his delegation strongly favoured alternating the Executive Board's annual sessions between Geneva and New York, as had been decided by the Governing Council in 1993. His delegation believed that, in the interest of effective participation, it would be better not to scatter sessions throughout the year. Particular attention should be given to timing, in order to allow for representation from capitals. Given its reduced membership, the Executive Board should adopt an open-door policy and encourage the active participation of non-governmental organizations.
2. Ms. VOLKOFF (Canada) said her delegation was in favour of a two-week annual session, but believed that two days would not suffice to cover the many topics proposed for the spring session. She hoped that in the future, given that the Executive Board served both the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), that UNFPA topics would be included in the regular sessions. While she understood the view of the representative of New Zealand that future Executive Board sessions should take place in New York, she agreed with other representatives that the Geneva option should be retained for the current year.
3. Mr. NIE Hua Liang (China) said that his delegation endorsed the proposed distribution of topics between annual and regular sessions. With regard to the duration of meetings, General Assembly resolution 48/162 stipulated that important questions of policy were to be discussed in the Economic and Social Council, and therefore, the Board's annual session should be shorter than the Governing Council's had been. His delegation had no preference with regard to the venue of sessions, as long as it was conducive to the full participation of all members. His delegation agreed that two regular sessions should be held yearly, one in the spring and one in the autumn, and that three sessions per year would be sufficient. To have too many meetings would pose organizational difficulties. Moreover, his delegation was of the view that the Executive Board would have greater opportunity for dialogue with the secretariat and that it should avoid micro-management. It should also be more transparent and encourage the participation of observers.
4. Mr. HORIGUCHI (Japan) said that the Executive Board was in a transitional year and should be as pragmatic as possible when adopting decisions. His delegation was flexible with regard to the frequency, timing and duration of regular and annual sessions. According to the schedule proposed by the Secretariat, a total of 21 working days had been allotted to the Executive Board, or seven days more than the previous year's Governing Council. He wished to learn from the secretariat whether services could be available for those additional days. Finally, with regard to the venue of sessions, his delegation supported the position of the representative of New Zealand.
5. Mr. STELZER (Observer for Austria) said that the decision adopted by the Governing Council regarding the venue of the 1994 annual session remained valid and required no review. It was too soon to make a final decision regarding the duration of the annual session, but if the proposed division of labour was

/...

(Mr. Stelzer, Observer, Austria)

adopted, then a two-week period was reasonable. Observers' opinions should be taken into consideration when the Executive Board decided which topics were of wide interest, particularly when those issues affected observers' interests. His delegation also supported the suggestion that the Office for Project Services (OPS), a topic of wide interest, should be discussed before the annual session within the framework of an informal mechanism, which should be set up as soon as possible and should be open to members of the Executive Board and observers.

6. Mr. ELIASHIV (Observer for Israel) agreed that observers should be given the opportunity to participate in meetings and receive all the documentation which was available to members. In general, his delegation supported the proposed division of labour and a two-week session in June.

7. Mr. ROHNER (Observer for Switzerland) said it was vital that UNDP organizational arrangements should be openly discussed and that all participating countries, including temporary observers, should be given a say in the debate. Annual meetings should be open to all members, observers and specialized agencies, and the topics discussed should be of interest to all participants, including those from the capitals. The Executive Board should set dates for regular sessions at the beginning of the year, rather than later, and in general, in the interest of transparency, it should work as little as possible on an ad hoc basis. It would be better to divide the workload among the specialists available to the Executive Board, and perhaps eventually revert to the use of subcommittees to deal with programming and financial matters. He endorsed the proposal that the annual sessions should be held in Europe in alternate years, as it was in the interest of UNDP to maintain contact with the agencies and capitals located there. More time should be devoted to UNFPA than in the past and, if possible, UNFPA country programmes should be considered together with UNDP country programmes.

8. Mr. HALDEA (India) said that his delegation favoured the two-week annual session and supported holding the 1994 annual session in Geneva. In general, sessions should be limited to three per year. His delegation strongly favoured maximizing observers' participation which it considered to be of great benefit to the Executive Board.

9. Mrs. AMERASEKARE (Observer for Sri Lanka) strongly supported the view that the participation of observer States in Executive Board meetings must be encouraged. While her delegation was flexible regarding the venue of the 1994 annual session, it was in favour of holding Executive Board sessions at UNDP headquarters in future years. The rules of procedure should be changed only if necessary; no amendment or interpretation of the rules of procedure, and no venue for meetings, should be such as to prevent observer States from participating in the annual or regular sessions if they so desired. Concerning the division of labour between annual and regular sessions, broad policy issues should be discussed at the annual session and other matters, including matters on which UNDP required immediate guidance, at the regular sessions. The working methods and division of labour should ultimately result in efficiency, transparency and accountability. That aim could be achieved by improving the quality and frequency of the flow of information regarding programmes, budgetary matters and administrative matters between UNDP and the Executive Board. An

/...

(Mrs. Amerasekare, Observer,
Sri Lanka)

advance agenda and a summary of decisions taken by the Executive Board would be considerably useful to member States in deciding whether to participate or not in such meetings.

10. For reasons of transparency and democracy, her delegation was opposed to ad hoc negotiating mechanisms. The number of regular sessions and the duration of annual sessions should be based on the workload before the Board.

11. Mr. BELLA (Slovakia) said that he was in favour of shorter and more frequent meetings and supported the holding of annual sessions alternately at United Nations Headquarters and the Geneva office. His delegation also advocated the participation of observers in Executive Board sessions, and would be in favour of a spring regular session in March 1994.

12. Mr. RAI (Papua New Guinea) said that his delegation had no problem with the secretariat's proposed dates for the 1994 sessions. Concerning the venue of the annual session, he agreed with the delegations of New Zealand and Japan that meeting at Geneva would present practical problems for many countries which had no missions there and were substantial recipients of UNDP development assistance. However, his delegation would join any consensus that emerged. It was in favour of a two-week annual session and shorter, more frequent regular sessions as necessary, including when the General Assembly was in session, and would like to see a flexible arrangement that would allow maximum observer participation in discussing matters of interest to member States. Where the Board's rules of procedure were concerned, those of the Governing Council should be used as the basis and adapted to changing circumstances.

13. Mr. GUERRERO (Philippines) said that his delegation favoured a two-week annual session with more frequent and shorter regular sessions. However, he was in principle against ad hoc mechanisms. Although his delegation would have no difficulties attending annual sessions at Geneva, it would prefer them to be held in New York. More concise but complete documentation would be appreciated. Those aspects of the rules of procedure of the Governing Council that were still relevant should be retained, and the United Nations Legal Counsel and UNDP should examine those rules in order to identify what was still valid in the light of General Assembly resolution 48/162. Should the Executive Board as whole be unable to draft new rules of procedure, that task could be entrusted to an ad hoc working group. As the Executive Board was in a process of transition, it was not important to come up with permanent rules of procedure right away. The eventual recommendations of the ad hoc working group could be used provisionally and adapted according to needs for a period of one to two years.

14. Mr. MAJID (Bangladesh) said that Executive Board sessions should take place in New York, so as to encourage maximum participation. Every opportunity should be given to observers to participate in meetings of the Board. The holding of Board meetings during the General Assembly could pose difficulties for some of the small delegations.

15. Mr. DIECKERT (Germany) said that as the current year was a transitional one for the Board, it should be flexible with respect to the admission of observers. In the medium term, the Board could fashion a more realistic admission procedure for observers in accordance with resolution 48/162 in order to facilitate smoother and more rapid decision-making. The Board itself should deal with substantive issues: there was no guarantee that the establishment of new committees would enhance the continuity of its work. In the case of very complex and sensitive issues, the Board might consider appointing a rapporteur to investigate the issues and prepare a basis for a decision. There was no need to prepare completely new rules of procedure from the outset, as the old rules were still applicable and could be amended in the light of developments in the work of the Board.

16. Mr. SIDDIG (Sudan) agreed with the representative of New Zealand and many other delegations that there were difficulties involved in holding sessions at Geneva. While his delegation could agree to the holding of the 1994 annual session there, it hoped that in future, such sessions could be held in New York. The Executive Board in its new shape was capable of facing the challenges before it, but in order for it to be effective, members needed to have the documents well before the sessions. His delegation had no objection in principle to having two-week annual sessions, and would like the regular sessions to be spread throughout the year.

17. Mr. GRAISSE (Secretary of the Executive Board), responding to the comment of the representative of Austria with respect to OPS, said that the issue had been proposed for consideration at the annual session in view of its importance to all delegations. However, since the regular sessions of the Board had the same power to take decisions, discussion of the issue could be advanced to an earlier meeting than June. Regarding the comment made by the representative of Japan that the Governing Council had met for 14 days in 1993, as opposed to the total of 21 days proposed for the Executive Board in 1994, he noted that the annual session in June 1993 had lasted 14 days, while the special session of the Council in February had brought the total to 18 working days. If it was planned to have the Board meeting as a whole to discuss most items, slightly more days would be required in 1994 than in 1993.

18. A large number of delegations seemed to prefer a brief meeting of the Board in March prior to the global meeting of resident representatives, in order to benefit from their presence in New York. If the country programmes along with mid-term reviews could be dealt with in March in one and a half to two days, then it would be feasible to hold such a meeting. In that case, the May session might need only two days instead of four full days.

19. There appeared to be some degree of support for a two-week annual session in June; three or four days could be allocated to UNFPA, a day or half a day to the Department for Development Support and Management Services (DDSMS) and perhaps a day to OPS, leaving a full week for UNDP. There appeared to be some preference for the last days of September for an additional regular session of the Board. While such an option would require last-minute approval by the General Assembly, he hoped it would be feasible. There did not appear to be any degree of unanimity on a meeting between September and January, while a number of delegations had expressed preference for a maximum of three meetings a year including the annual session. He therefore wondered whether delegations would

(Mr. Graisse)

insist on having an additional session at a time when the Second Committee would be in full swing and many delegations would be very busy dealing with other issues.

20. According to paragraph 27 of General Assembly resolution 48/162, the regular meetings of the Boards should be held at the premises of the headquarters of the respective organization as of the date when such premises were rendered possible to accommodate such meetings. The Executive Boards of the funds and programmes were encouraged to make the necessary facilities available as soon as possible without prejudice to the resources of existing programmes and projects. UNDP had been reviewing ways to accommodate the new 36-member Executive Board within its current headquarters premises. In New York, UNDP and UNFPA were dispersed over five buildings. The Sub-Group on Common Premises and Services had tentatively identified a building in the vicinity of the United Nations Secretariat building as a potential site for the consolidated premises of UNDP and UNFPA and for an overflow from UNICEF. In the event of a decision to retain UNDP in New York, all of UNDP and its associated funds, UNFPA and part of UNICEF could relocate to that building within two years.

21. The allocation of 50 per cent of a floor in the DC1 building to instal a meeting room for the Executive Board would provide adequate space for Board members and one additional person per delegation, observers and so on. However, the room in the DC1 building, which would accommodate between 80 and 100 persons, had some limitations. The view within the room would be obstructed by pillars and, because of the ceiling height, smaller than standard interpretation booths would have to be installed. Alternatively, consideration could be given to the technical and economic feasibility of providing simultaneous interpretation through closed-circuit television monitors installed in the meeting room and connected to interpretation facilities in the Secretariat building.

22. The estimated cost of installing the meeting room was approximately \$800,000. An additional annual amount of \$300,000 would be required to rent space for displaced organizational units. The Fifth Committee had reviewed the matter and had agreed that the question should be examined by the Secretary-General and the executive heads of UNDP, UNFPA and UNICEF, and that the Secretary-General should report thereon to the General Assembly. If the members of the Board agreed, the Executive Board would prepare, in conjunction with the Secretariat, a full survey and full cost estimates relating to a meeting room for the Board in the DC1 building. The survey would be reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ), the General Assembly and the Executive Board.

23. The Executive Board might consider requesting the UNICEF secretariat to make available a meeting room in UNICEF House for meetings of the Executive Board of UNDP and UNFPA. That could serve as a tentative solution pending the move to a new building in 1996.

24. Mr. AMAZIANE (Morocco) said that the Board should ensure that observers were able to attend all Board meetings.

25. Mr. GRAISSE (Secretary of the Executive Board) said that the room in the DC1 building would provide adequate space for Board members and observers. The room would accommodate approximately 80 to 100 persons.
26. Mr. HORIGUCHI (Japan) asked what expenditure was covered under the additional annual amount of \$300,000.
27. Mr. GRAISSE (Secretary of the Executive Board) said that the \$300,000 represented the annual cost of renting commercial space in another building, in the vicinity of the Secretariat building, in order to relocate the staff currently occupying about half a floor in the DC1 building.
28. Mrs. RIBEIRO-VANDERANWERA (Belgium) inquired whether the Board had decided to hold a two-day session in March and a two-day session in May. Such scheduling could pose difficulties for a number of delegations.
29. Mr. GRAISSE (Secretary of the Executive Board) said that it was up to the members of the Board to decide when to meet. He had merely wished to indicate that the necessary facilities and conference services would be available for meetings in March and May.
30. Mr. DIECKERT (Germany) said that the Board would take a decision on the headquarters location of UNDP and UNFPA at its annual session in June. He wished to point out that another location would probably not create additional costs for adequate meeting facilities. The Board should request the Administrator of UNDP to prepare, together with UNFPA, a report on the facilities and benefits and the cost of providing adequate meeting facilities in New York in order to enable the members of the Board to make a more informed decision.
31. Mr. EIDHAMMER (Norway) said that the Board should request the Secretariat to prepare a revised version of the proposals that had been made in order to enable the members of the Board to comment at the next meeting.
32. Mr. TAZADRID SUAREZ (Cuba) said that the Executive Board should provide a clear indication of the costs of holding sessions in New York, Geneva or elsewhere.
33. Mr. GRAISSE (Secretary of the Executive Board) said that the cost of holding meetings of the Governing Council at Geneva instead of in New York had been discussed in previous years. It might therefore be expedient to circulate the document that had been made available to the Governing Council at its last session.
34. Mr. GUERRERO (Philippines) said that it would be difficult for observer delegations to attend meetings of the Executive Board at venues other than New York. Therefore, apart from the financial costs, the Board should consider the qualitative costs, and its decision should be based on both.
35. Mr. PEDERSEN (Denmark) said that, if the Board held its meetings at UNDP headquarters, it would be necessary to rent premises outside the UNDP building, at an annual cost of \$300,000. It would therefore be more economical if UNICEF House was able to accommodate the 20 annual meetings of the Executive Board.

36. Mr. KING (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation would have difficulty attending a two-day session in March and would have preferred that the Board held a four-day session in May. While his delegation remained flexible with respect to the September session, it would be reluctant to attend meetings scheduled after the Second Committee had begun its work.
37. Mr. BABA (Observer for Uganda) said that, in taking decisions regarding meeting arrangements, the Board must take into account the interests of observer delegations. While the Secretary of the Executive Board had indicated that the room in the DC1 building could accommodate between 80 and 100 participants, including observers, past experience had shown that certain agenda items tended to attract more than 100 participants.
38. The PRESIDENT said that he would consult delegations regarding the timing of the spring sessions and would report to the Board as soon as possible.
39. Mr. GUERRERO (Philippines) said that the President should consult with delegations with a view to reaching agreement on the venue of the Board's summer session.
40. Mr. VAN ARENDONK (Deputy Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund) said that, at its annual session, the Board could discuss policy papers, while at its regular session it could discuss other documents not directly related to policy, as well as country programmes. UNDP and UNFPA country programmes relating to the same country should be discussed at the same time. At its annual session, the Board could consider the work plan and the review and assessment studies, while the annual financial review and audit report could be dealt with in September. In May, the Board could take up the periodic report and the report on contraceptive requirements. The various country programmes could be considered at all of those sessions.
41. The PRESIDENT invited the members of the Executive Board to consider the question of amending the rules of procedure of the Governing Council in order to bring them into line with General Assembly resolution 48/162.
42. Mr. AMAZIANE, supported by Mr. KING (Trinidad and Tobago), Mr. MACHIN (United Kingdom) and Mr. FERNANDEZ-PITA (Observer for Spain), proposed that the Executive Board should request the Secretariat, through the Office of the Legal Counsel, to prepare a paper containing proposals on the articles of the rules of procedures of the Governing Council that needed to be amended. There was no need for the Board to consider the rules of procedure article by article, since most of the rules did not require amendment.
43. Mr. GUERRERO (Philippines) suggested that a special working group, or a working group of the whole, which would be chaired by the President, should prepare a paper on the rules of procedure that required amendment.
44. Mr. EIDHAMMER (Norway) supported the proposal to establish a working group. At the same time, the Board should have an opportunity to discuss the rules of procedure in more general terms in order to provide some guidance to the group.

45. The PRESIDENT said that it was his understanding that the Executive Board wished to seek the guidance of the Legal Counsel concerning the rules that needed to be amended in the light of General Assembly resolution 48/162. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the members of the Board agreed to establish a working group of the whole to consider the matter.

46. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.



**Executive Board of
the United Nations
Development Programme
and of the United Nations
Population Fund**

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1994/SR.3
3 March 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

First regular session of 1994

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 3rd MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 16 February 1994, at 11 a.m.

President:

Mr. ANSARI

(India)

CONTENTS

Organization of the work of the Executive Board (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The meeting was called to order at 11.20 a.m.

ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT said that the Bureau had formulated a proposal regarding the schedule of Executive Board meetings for the year. On 18 March, an informal briefing would be held with resident representatives, immediately prior to their meeting, followed by a regular session of the Executive Board from 10 to 13 May. As for the annual session, in the light of the views expressed by delegations and the rules of procedure, the Bureau proposed that the Governing Council's decision in that regard should be maintained for 1994 and that the Executive Board should meet in Geneva from 6 to 17 June, without prejudice to any decision it might take at that time on the provisions of the rules of procedure governing the venue for the Board's meetings. The dates of 28 to 30 September had been suggested for a third regular session, but the Bureau would like to explore the possibility of meeting from 5 to 7 October, between the high-level segment of the General Assembly and the start of the Second Committee's work. A regular session was proposed for 10 to 13 January 1995.
2. Mr. AMAZIANE (Morocco) said that the Group of 77 should be consulted in order to avoid any conflict between the dates of its annual meeting and the proposed October session.
3. Mr. EIDHAMMER (Norway) drew attention to the need for continuity in the work of the Executive Board. In the view of his delegation, regular sessions should be spread out over the year in order to ensure that dialogue was maintained. The meeting proposed for 18 March would be more efficient if it could be a regular meeting where decisions could be taken, although not all delegations would be able to be represented. Because the period from September to January was quite lengthy, he wondered if a regular meeting could be held in November, if necessary.
4. The PRESIDENT said that the objective of the proposed March meeting was an informal exchange with resident representatives regarding conditions in the field. The secretariat would be involved in preparation for the resident representatives' meeting and would be unable to prepare for an Executive Board session at the same time. It was clear, from the response to the proposal of the Bureau, that sessions should be held on as close to a quarterly basis as possible. Since the Executive Board was in its first year, the schedule could be fine-tuned in the light of experience.
5. Mr. PEDERSEN (Denmark) acknowledged the constraints on holding a full Board session in March, but suggested that only country programmes already prepared should be taken up at that time. The session should be extended to include 17 March. His delegation also would have preferred holding more than one regular session between the annual session and January 1995.
6. Mr. SPETH (Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme) said that the meeting of resident representatives was an unusual event of very great importance, and full advantage must be taken of the opportunity it presented. An informal meeting between the Executive Board and the resident representatives would be a good use of resources, but it would be very difficult for UNDP senior management staff to prepare for a full Board session at the same time.

7. Ms. DOWSETT (New Zealand) said that her delegation had already expressed its strong views on the venue of future annual sessions. It believed that the "headquarters rule" should apply to UNDP, for administrative and financial reasons, but also in order to ensure the broadest possible participation. However, it was prepared to accept the proposal to hold the June session at Geneva on the understanding that the choice of that venue was an exception and was without prejudice to any future decisions. She requested more details on the actual costs and levels of participation for both New York and Geneva.
8. Mr. CABEIRO-QUINTANA (Cuba) said that the proposed March meeting should remain an informal discussion; it would be detrimental to the efficiency of the secretariat to keep it in a constant state of preparation for Board meetings.
9. Mrs. VASISHT (India) said that her delegation accepted the proposal of the Bureau. Converting the March meeting to a formal session would pose a problem for her delegation, which might not be able to participate. Since the meeting of resident representatives was not a yearly event, holding a formal session in conjunction with it would set a precedent that could not be maintained. As a developing country, India's resources would be sufficient to cover only the four sessions proposed.
10. Ms. RIBEIRO-VANDERAUWERA (Belgium) said that her delegation supported the proposal of the Bureau. Executive Board meetings approximately every three months would be acceptable, but more frequent meetings might place a strain on the human and financial resources of delegations.
11. Mr. JALLOW (Gambia) said that his delegation supported the proposed schedule of meetings and favoured an informal meeting in March. Discussions with the resident representatives would be of great benefit and would help in the preparations for the annual session in June. Too many meetings however, would not be helpful to smaller delegations. Board meetings were of great interest to recipient countries, but holding meetings that they were unable to attend could be counterproductive.
12. Mr. GORELIK (Russian Federation) welcomed the proposed schedule of meetings for the coming year and the efforts of the Bureau to resolve the question of the venue of the annual session to the satisfaction of all. He agreed with the representative of New Zealand that the substantive discussion on that issue should not be initiated until the rules of procedure had been reviewed. However, Geneva was the home of many specialized agencies of the United Nations system involved in the implementation of development programmes and was, therefore, the logical place to hold the Executive Board session. During the current period of budgetary restraint, the number of days allocated for all Board sessions combined should not exceed the number authorized for the former Governing Council.
13. Ms. VOLKOFF (Canada) said that the Bureau's recommendations were an acceptable compromise. Adequate time had been provided to cover the Board's projected workload and additional meetings could be requested, if necessary. She therefore appealed to delegations to accept the proposals and to move on to the consideration of other items.

14. Mr. PASHA (Pakistan) said that his delegation had been satisfied with the secretariat's earlier proposal. If implemented, the new recommendations would make it difficult for members to follow up the Board's decisions. As for the duration of the annual session, two weeks would be adequate. He agreed with the delegation of Morocco that the scheduling of meetings from 5 to 7 October should be reviewed, given the special demands of the General Assembly period.

15. Mr. RAMOUL (Observer for Algeria) said that, in order to avoid scheduling problems, particularly for the developing countries, the Group of 77 should be consulted before the Board determined the dates of its meetings in October.

16. Mr. Yeong Hyeon LEE (Republic of Korea) said that it would be useful to know the costs of holding the annual session at Geneva and in New York, respectively. Holding the regular session in June was acceptable to his delegation.

17. Mr. MACHIN (United Kingdom) said that, while it was tempting to transform the March meetings into a regular session of the Board, the Administration of the United Nations Development Programme should be focusing at that time on its meeting with the resident representatives. He shared the view of the Canadian delegation that the Board should adopt a flexible approach to the organization of its work.

18. Mr. HORIGUCHI (Japan) said that the Bureau's recommendations and New Zealand's proviso that the choice of venue for the June session was without prejudice to future decisions were acceptable to his delegation. With regard to the number of annual sessions, he agreed with the Cuban delegation that the scheduling of too many sessions would make it difficult for the secretariat to deal with its normal workload. Many issues could in fact be settled through informal discussions.

19. Mr. YAO Wen Long (China) said that the Bureau's proposals were reasonable and therefore acceptable to his delegation.

20. Mr. ACHA (Peru) said that the holding of regular sessions alternately at Headquarters and at Geneva was not an efficient use of resources. New York was the more appropriate venue, since the presence of permanent missions to the Organization facilitated follow-up activities, particularly by the developing countries. Responding to the argument that a number of relevant United Nations organizations were located at Geneva, he said that it was easier for those organizations to send representatives to New York than for the developing countries to send representatives to Geneva. The efficiency of the Board depended on how its work was organized and not on the number of its meetings. He, too, believed that it was time to move on to other, more substantive items on the agenda.

21. Mr. ABIBI (Congo) said that his delegation accepted the Bureau's compromise proposals. The work of the Board should be organized in such a way as to ensure the participation of all countries, particularly the developing countries and observer States.

22. Mr. MONROE (United States of America) said that the proposed meeting schedule for the current period of transition was generally acceptable to his delegation, although he was sympathetic to New Zealand's caveat concerning future venues of the regular session.

23. Mr. NEUMANN (Germany) said that the Board should endorse the Bureau's recommendations and be ready to learn from its experiences in 1994. It was time to move on to the consideration of more substantive items.

24. Mr. KING (Trinidad and Tobago) said that the Bureau's recommendations and the proviso introduced by New Zealand were broadly acceptable to his delegation. However, the meetings scheduled for 5 to 7 October would conflict with the ministerial meeting of the Group of 77 and the Board should therefore revert to the dates in September which had been proposed earlier.

25. Mr. ROHNER (Observer for Switzerland) said that the Bureau's proposals were reasonable and acceptable to his delegation. For future meetings, however, it might be better to follow the practice of other United Nations bodies and arrange for the organizational session to be followed by the regular session. With regard to the report to the Economic and Social Council, he hoped that, in future, that report would be considered by the regular session of the Board before submission to the Council. There must now be a break with previous practice in which the secretariat basically compiled the various decisions of the Governing Council and submitted them to the Economic and Social Council.

26. The PRESIDENT said that the Board's recommendations had been motivated by a concern for efficiency and practicality. The dates agreed upon at the current session were not immutable and could be reviewed, if necessary. The Board was in a period of transition and needed to retain a flexible approach to its methods of work. It was important to approve the schedule for 1994, after which other questions, such as the venue for the 1994 regular session, could be decided. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Board wished to adopt the proposals of the Bureau concerning the organization of the work of the Executive Board.

27. It was so decided.

28. Mr. GRAISSE (Secretary of the Executive Board), replying to questions asked, said that, in general, meetings of all resident representatives were held once every five years; in 1994, the meeting was being advanced because of the reorganization that was taking place. A paper comparing the costs of holding meetings at Geneva and in New York had been circulated in 1993; it was unlikely that there had been any significant change in the cost estimates. On the question of the Board's report to the Economic and Social Council, he said that the Council had not yet determined how it would consider such reports; more information would be available by the time of the annual session.

29. With regard to the documentation for future sessions, a paper had been circulated showing the division of labour between the annual session and the regular sessions of the Board. At the May session, the Board could consider the country programmes which had originally been prepared for the February session (Albania and Slovakia); a number of country programmes had been prepared for June and as many of them as possible would be moved to the May session, although it could not be guaranteed that all of them would be available. At the May

(Mr. Graisse)

session there would be an overview of the mid-term reviews relating to India, Indonesia and Zambia and, if possible, the mid-term reviews relating to Cape Verde and China. The request for "as if" LDC status from the Government of Albania could be taken up at that session, and also the question of the Office for Project Services (OPS).

30. The Executive Director of UNFPA had indicated that she would be willing to have the items relating to UNFPA taken up in May, June or September; however, it would be easier if they were all taken up at the June session. There were a great many documents to be considered at the May session and more time would be available in June; at the annual session, the first week would be devoted to UNDP and the second, to UNFPA, OPS and the Department for Development Support and Management Services.

31. The Board would have to decide whether the annual financial review and audit reports of UNFPA should be taken up in September or June; they would be available in June, if necessary. There would then be a number of papers, mainly concerning financial matters relating to UNDP, to be taken up in September.

32. Mr. NEUMANN (Germany) said that time should be set aside for UNFPA at the May session, so that the Board would have an opportunity to follow the activities of UNFPA over the course of the year.

33. Mr. GRAISSE (Secretary of the Executive Board) said that the current year was very heavy for UNFPA because of the International Conference on Population and Development; it would therefore be better if the items relating to UNFPA were concentrated at the June session. It would also be easier for national population specialists to attend a single session, rather than two sessions, in May and June.

34. Mr. MICHEL (France) said that the item concerning the United Nations Volunteers (UNV) should be taken up in June since the annual meeting of UNV would be held at Geneva. The items concerning the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office and the Humanitarian Programme, should also be taken up at that session; it would then be possible to liaise with Geneva-based humanitarian organizations. That arrangement would alleviate the workload of the May session. Population questions could be taken up in October, rather than at the June session, so that there would be time to assess the results of the International Conference on Population and Development.

35. Ms. VOLKOFF (Canada) said that there were only two country programmes, for the Islamic Republic of Iran and Zambia, which concerned both UNDP and UNFPA, and the current year was exceptional because of the International Conference on Population and Development; she therefore supported the proposed organization of work, although she felt that in future years country programmes should be kept together.

36. Mr. MACHIN (United Kingdom) said that it would be an advantage to take up the financial audit reports of both UNDP and UNFPA in September, rather than having one report in June and the other in September, since the same people would be dealing with those issues.

37. Mr. VAN ARENDONK (Deputy Executive Director, United Nations Population Fund) said that it would be acceptable to UNFPA for its financial audit report to be taken up in September, and also for the UNFPA items to be taken up at the annual session.

38. Mr. GRAISSE (Secretary of the Executive Board) said that a postmortem on the International Conference on Population and Development could be held in either September or October. Some documents that were to have been taken up at the May session could be moved to the June session. He would consult with colleagues in the United Nations Volunteers, the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office and the humanitarian programmes to see if they had a particular reason to prefer the May session; he believed that that was true of the United Nations Volunteers.

39. Mr. VAN ARENDONK (Deputy Executive Director, United Nations Population Fund) said that UNFPA would prefer if most of its agenda was taken up at the annual session because ongoing activities of country programmes could be disrupted if funding was not approved. The UNFPA Review and Assessment study was to be carried out prior to the International Conference on Population and Development; it was therefore important for that paper to be taken up before the Conference. The Board might wish to set aside some time at its September session to consider the outcome of the Conference. It would be difficult for UNFPA if all its agenda was postponed until October.

40. Mr. AMAZIANE (Morocco) said that since the Board had decided to take up general issues at the annual session, questions of environment and development, humanitarian questions and the human development report should be taken up at the June session because of their special importance.

41. Mr. EIDHAMMER (Norway) said that the division of labour had been prepared very carefully and should be left as it stood.

42. Ms. DOWSETT (New Zealand) said that the representative of Morocco had made a valid point; on the basis of the rationale for the allocation of items, questions of the environment and of humanitarian programmes should be taken up at the annual session. That would also lighten the agenda of the May session.

43. Mr. MACHIN (United Kingdom) said that the Board should take a flexible approach. A number of issues that were to be considered at the regular sessions might well be taken up at the annual session. The division of labour should be left as it was, with the possibility of fine-tuning it at a later stage.

44. Mr. KING (Trinidad and Tobago) said that he agreed that the issues to which the representative of Morocco had referred were important, and should be taken up at the annual session; he also agreed that the Board should proceed in a flexible manner, especially in a year of transition. The Board should not rule out the possibility of reverting to items which had been taken up at the May session.

45. Ms. VOLKOFF (Canada) said that the Board should rely on the Secretariat to make decisions on the allocation of items on the basis of the content of items. For example, the general aspects of environment and development could be taken up at the annual session, while technical issues could be taken up at the May session.

46. Ms. RIBEIRO VANDERAUWERA (Belgium) said that the three issues referred to by the representative of Morocco were vital for the future role of UNDP and should be considered as a matter of priority at the June session.

47. Mr. CLAVIJO (Observer for Colombia) said that an additional criterion in the allocation of items should be the urgency of the decisions that were required. If urgent decisions were needed on the items of environment and development and humanitarian assistance, those items should be taken up at the May session.

48. Mr. SERSALE di CERISANO (Argentina) said that the questions of environment and development should be taken up at the June session because UNDP would report to the Board on the basis of the meeting of the Commission on Sustainable Development in May. In view of the content of resolution 93/11, the item on the humanitarian programme was more concerned with budgetary aspects and could be taken up at the May session.

49. Mr. GRAISSE (Secretary of the Executive Board) said that a revised list of items would be produced, taking into account the views expressed.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.